## EXHIBIT L

## Case 3:18-cv-00121-MEM-MCC Document 81-14 Filed 09/21/22 Page 2 of 17 CERTIFIED COPY

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JILL BALLARD, REBECCA VARNO, and MARK POKORNI on behalf of themselves and the class members described herein,

Plaintiffs,

Civil No.

vs.

3:18-cv-00121-MEM-MCC

NAVIENT CORPORATION,
NAVIENT SOLUTIONS, INC., and
NAVIENT SOLUTIONS, LLC,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_

Deposition of JEFFREY A. STINE

June 24, 2022

Misty Klapper, RMR, CRR and Notary Public.  $484458\,$ 





1 to facilitate the renewal process of an IDR plan, 2 was that a fairly common occurrence? 3 Α. I wouldn't say it's neither common I mean, it's a scenario that 4 nor uncommon. 5 There's multiple scenarios that kind of happens. 6 occur throughout the, you know, IDR initial enrollment and reenrollment, recertification. 8 Now, discretionary forbearances can Ο. be requested either in writing or orally over the 9 10 phone; is that right? 11 Α. That's correct. 12 And as a general practice, has Ο. 13 Navient permitted borrowers who have not defaulted on their loans to enroll in 14 15 discretionary forbearances based on oral affirmation? 16 17 Α. We have, yes. Would you agree that when a -- I'm 18 Q. 19 sorry -- when a discretionary forbearance is processed over the phone, that usually involves 20 21 the IDR renewal process? Is that fair to say? 22 Α. No, I don't think that's accurate. Is there another scenario that's more 23 Ο. 24 common where someone will request a discretionary

forbearance over the phone for a different kind

of reason?

- A. They may request it, you know, on its own just to resolve their current outstanding delinquency without going into an IDR plan. They may request it for, you know, other scenarios if they're going to go into a particular deferment enrollment or if they're looking to consolidate their loans. Generally any time they're talking to the customer service agent, you know, if they are trying to attempt to resolve their delinquency, that -- that could be a solution.
- Q. Okay. But based on the scenario you were generally describing earlier, is it fair to say that the IDR renewal process is one of the more common reasons a person might request a discretionary forbearance over the phone?
  - A. Yes.
- Q. When a hardship forbearance -- I'm sorry -- a discretionary forbearance is requested in writing, in your experience, is that also involved with the IBR renewal process or is it less likely that a discretionary forbearance requested in writing has anything to do with the IBR renewal process?
- A. That could occur. Generally if it's

| 1  | people's loans balances don't increase while     |
|----|--|
| 2  | their loan servicer is doing routine paper       |
| 3  | processing; is that your understanding?          |
| 4  | A. Yes. So the loan balances do not              |
| 5  | increase so the customer does not, you know,     |
| 6  | incur additional delinquency during that time    |
| 7  | period as well.                                  |
| 8  | Q. Now, the 60-day administrative                |
| 9  | forbearance is also different from a             |
| 10 | discretionary forbearance because the 60-day     |
| 11 | administrative forbearance does not need to be   |
| 12 | specifically requested by the borrower. It       |
| 13 | should be applied automatically, correct?        |
| 14 | A. It does not need to be requested              |
| 15 | specifically by the customer, no.                |
| 16 | Q. And I'm guessing there would be no            |
| 17 | need to enroll a borrower in a discretionary     |
| 18 | forbearance during the same period when they're  |
| 19 | enrolled in a 60-day administrative forbearance; |
| 20 | is that right?                                   |
| 21 | A. That is correct.                              |
| 22 | Q. If that happened, that would cancel           |
| 23 | out the benefit of the administrative            |
| 24 | forbearance, correct?                            |
| 25 | Nell won cannot have won know two                |

| 1  | removed.  |
|----|---|
| 2  | Q. Do you know why that would have                |
| 3  | happened?   |
| 4  | A. I'm not sure exactly why that would            |
| 5  | have happened, other than the discussion with the |
| 6  | customer as to the period of time to be covered   |
| 7  | by that forbearance.                              |
| 8  | Q. Now, the 60-day administrative                 |
| 9  | forbearance was applied in this situation because |
| 10 | she was in the process of trying to apply for a   |
| 11 | change in repayment plan, correct?                |
| 12 | A. Correct.                                       |
| 13 | Q. So that administrative forbearance             |
| 14 | probably should have stayed in place.             |
| 15 | Would you agree?                                  |
| 16 | A. Yeah, it means she was still                   |
| 17 | intending to submit that documentation.           |
| 18 | Q. We talked earlier about whether these          |
| 19 | verbal forbearances would ever overlap with an    |
| 20 | administrative forbearance and I know you've      |
| 21 | testified that that's not typically the case.     |
| 22 | I mean, considering that it seems to              |
| 23 | have happened here to some degree, have you ever  |
| 24 | seen this situation before or is this the first   |
| 25 | time you've seen this?                            |

| 1  | A. Yeah. And one thing I would like to           |
|----|--|
| 2  | correct as well is a previous statement I made   |
| 3  | with regards to policies and procedures          |
| 4  | associated with the customer submitting one      |
| 5  | paystub.   |
| 6  | And so I incorrectly stated that we              |
| 7  | would have required or that we should have       |
| 8  | required two consecutive paystubs. That would    |
| 9  | only be necessary in the case where we could not |
| 10 | determine the frequency of the pay.              |
| 11 | But in that case, when you do look               |
| 12 | closely at the paystub, there is a pay period    |
| 13 | listed on the paystub. And so that paystub would |
| 14 | have been sufficient for us to determine that    |
| 15 | there would have been 26 pay periods in a year   |
| 16 | and determine what a monthly income would have   |
| 17 | been.  |
| 18 | Q. Okay. So does that mean that looks            |
| 19 | like another a processing error, that that       |
| 20 | based on the fact that the pay frequency was     |
| 21 | indicated on the paystub, that should have been  |
| 22 | accepted?  |
| 23 | A. Correct.                                      |
| 24 | Q. And, Mr. Stine, I actually because            |
| 25 | now we're talking about a navgtub that we gnoke  |

| 1  | about before we took lunch. So it might be        |
|----|---|
| 2  | easier to just and thank you for correcting       |
| 3  | the record. I do appreciate you doing that.       |
| 4  | Would that have been that would                   |
| 5  | have been the first paystub that we looked at     |
| 6  | during today's this might be the easiest way,     |
| 7  | without having to go back.                        |
| 8  | A. Yeah.  |
| 9  | Q. What you're referring to is the first          |
| 10 | paystub that she submitted of her husband's       |
| 11 | income; is that right?                            |
| 12 | A. That's correct.                                |
| 13 | Q. Okay. Then we don't have to go back.           |
| 14 | MR. FIORENTINO: Can you display                   |
| 15 | that page again, Cassandra?                       |
| 16 | BY MR. FIORENTINO:                                |
| 17 | Q. And while we're waiting for that,              |
| 18 | Mr. Stine, I just want to clarify. The way that   |
| 19 | you document pay frequency for the                |
| 20 | income-sensitive repayment plan, it's basically   |
| 21 | the same way that you would document it for the   |
| 22 | income-based repayment plan generally?            |
| 23 | A. Generally, yes. The calculation on             |
| 24 | income-sensitive is done on a monthly basis. The  |
| 25 | calculation for the income-driven repayment plans |

| 1  | is a little bit differently and usually based on |
|----|--|
| 2  | annual salary. But generally, yes.               |
| 3  | Q. Okay. So we're now on                         |
| 4  | MR. FIORENTINO: Do we need to                    |
| 5  | label this one, Cassandra, or are we still       |
| 6  | on the same document?                            |
| 7  | MS. MILLER: Is this if you're                    |
| 8  | still on 186 what page number?                   |
| 9  | MR. FIORENTINO: Yeah, still on                   |
| 10 | 1864.  |
| 11 | MS. MILLER: Okay. So then this is                |
| 12 | part of Number 26 that was previously            |
| 13 | marked.  |
| 14 | BY MR. FIORENTINO:                               |
| 15 | Q. Okay. So this is a letter Navient             |
| 16 | sent to Varno on March 25, 2015. And this seems  |
| 17 | to inform her that her income documentation was  |
| 18 | not acceptable because the borrower has to       |
| 19 | provide two consecutive paystubs.                |
| 20 | Now, I think you were just explaining            |
| 21 | that's only if the paystub on its face does not  |
| 22 | indicate the pay frequency; is that right?       |
| 23 | A. Correct.                                      |
| 24 | Q. Okay. Do you do you feel that the             |
| 25 | use of this letter in this instance was          |
|    |  |

| 1  | inappropriate or maybe misapplied, given the      |
|----|---|
| 2  | nature of the income documentation she submitted? |
| 3  | A. Yes, I would agree.                            |
| 4  | MR. FIORENTINO: All right. Let's                  |
| 5  | go to let's go to NSL_VARNO_0002304.              |
| 6  | MS. MILLER: And this is part of                   |
| 7  | the previously marked Exhibit Number 25.          |
| 8  | BY MR. FIORENTINO:                                |
| 9  | Q. So here there's an entry in the                |
| 10 | account history dated April 6, 2015. Can you      |
| 11 | just explain that entry, Mr. Stine?               |
| 12 | There are actually a few. One of                  |
| 13 | them says, IBR submitted. Awaiting documentation  |
| 14 | review.   |
| 15 | Could you start with that one?                    |
| 16 | A. Sure. So looking at that in the                |
| 17 | entry, it would appear that there's nothing       |
| 18 | that you have before that in addition to the      |
| 19 | 4-6 any other 4-6-15 entries associated? I        |
| 20 | don't know if you have that.                      |
| 21 | MR. FIORENTINO: Thank you,                        |
| 22 | Cassandra.  |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: Okay. Yeah, that's                   |
| 24 | fine. So nothing nothing else. You                |
| 25 | can scroll forward.                               |

1 document, I recall that the previous verbal 2 forbearance was ending on 3-18. It is now 4-13. 3 So they're processing this forbearance at that 4 time. 5 And this is basically to allow for Q. 6 more time for her to gather and submit this documentation to enroll in the repayment plan? 8 Yeah, without -- my recollection is Α. she had not been making any payments. And so on 9 10 4-13 she would have been delinquent for her 11 March -- or for her -- she would be coming due 12 for her 4-18 payment. 13 Now, if the -- if the 60-day Ο. 14 administrative forbearance that was put in place 15 on March 11, 2015, if that had remained in 16 effect, she would not have been delinquent at 17 all, right? 18 Α. That's correct. 19 So it looks like this verbal forbearance, she really didn't need that, right, 20 if the 60-day administrative forbearance had been 21 22 used? The issue would have been that she 23 24 submitted the documentation -- yeah, if we apply

the administrative 60-day forbearance, the verbal

| 1  | forbearance would not have been necessary.        |
|----|---|
| 2  | Q. Okay. So given that this forbearance           |
| 3  | here wasn't unnecessary, is it your understanding |
| 4  | that this might have caused her to incur          |
| 5  | additional charges that were unnecessary?         |
| 6  | A. She would have incurred capitalized            |
| 7  | interest at the expiration of this forbearance.   |
| 8  | MR. FIORENTINO: Let's go to                       |
| 9  | NSL_VARNO_0001869.                                |
| 10 | BY MR. FIORENTINO:                                |
| 11 | Q. And while this is coming up,                   |
| 12 | Mr. Stine, I think you touched on this earlier,   |
| 13 | but this whole issue of being enrolled in a       |
| 14 | verbal forbearance when you're supposed to be in  |
| 15 | a 60-day administrative forbearance, is this      |
| 16 | still the first time you've ever seen this        |
| 17 | situation or is this something you've ever seen   |
| 18 | on a different account?                           |
| 19 | A. No, I don't recall seeing this on any          |
| 20 | other account.                                    |
| 21 | Q. Okay.  |
| 22 | MR. FIORENTINO: Is this a new                     |
| 23 | exhibit, Cassandra?                               |
| 24 | MS. MILLER: Yes. So this is going                 |
| 25 | to be Exhibit Number 27, which will               |
|    |   |

| 1  | A. That's correct.                               |
|----|--|
| 2  | Q. And the letter it also states that            |
| 3  | he's going to be paid on a semi-monthly basis.   |
| 4  | Do you see where it says that?                   |
| 5  | A. Yes.  |
| 6  | Q. So the letter of hire indicates the           |
| 7  | frequency of pay, correct?                       |
| 8  | A. Correct.                                      |
| 9  | MR. FIORENTINO: Let's go to                      |
| 10 | NSL_VARNO_0002313.                               |
| 11 | MS. MILLER: This will be a page in               |
| 12 | Exhibit Number 30, which was previously          |
| 13 | marked.  |
| 14 | BY MR. FIORENTINO:                               |
| 15 | Q. So this is another page from the              |
| 16 | account records. On May 26, 2016 there's an      |
| 17 | entry where I think there's a typo. I think      |
| 18 | it means to says spouse. It looks like it says   |
| 19 | spose. But I think it says, Spouse send in offer |
| 20 | letter not accepted, POI.                        |
| 21 | Do you see where it says that?                   |
| 22 | A. The date that entry was made again?           |
| 23 | I'm sorry.                                       |
| 24 | Q. It would be May 26, 2016.                     |
| 25 | MS. SIMONETTI: We don't have May                 |
|    |  |

```
1
           up here. You have to move it down a
 2
           little bit.
 3
                   THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm looking at
 4
           April.
 5
                   MR. FIORENTINO: We should be on
            2313.
 6
 7
                   MS. MILLER:
                                Sorry about that.
 8
                   MS. SIMONETTI:
                                   It's okay.
9
                   MS. MILLER: There. That should be
10
           the right page.
11
                   MR. FIORENTINO:
                                   Okay.
12
                   BY MR. FIORENTINO:
                   So it's toward the middle of the
13
           Ο.
14
      page, Mr. Stine. It says spose.
                                         I believe it's
15
      supposed to say spouse, but it says, Spouse send
16
      in offer letter not accepted, proof of income.
17
                   Do you see where it says that?
18
           Α.
                   Yes.
19
           Ο.
                   Can you explain that entry?
                   It looks like they are not accepting
20
           Α.
21
      the offer letter as proof of income. POI is an
22
      acronym there used.
23
                  Do you know why they might have
           Ο.
24
      rejected it?
25
           Α.
                   I do not.
```

| 1  | Q. In your own estimation, do you think          |
|----|--|
| 2  | it should have been accepted?                    |
| 3  | A. I do.   |
| 4  | Q. Okay.   |
| 5  | MR. FIORENTINO: Let's go down                    |
| 6  | to actually, let's just go to Varno              |
| 7  | 0002389. No, I'm sorry. Let's skip that.         |
| 8  | I'm going to just try to skip ahead as           |
| 9  | much as I can. I'm just trying to see            |
| 10 | what I can skip in the interest of time,         |
| 11 | so just give me one second.                      |
| 12 | Let's go ahead to                                |
| 13 | NSL_VARNO_0002314.                               |
| 14 | MS. MILLER: This is also part of                 |
| 15 | Exhibit Number 30. And this is page 2314.        |
| 16 | BY MR. FIORENTINO:                               |
| 17 | Q. So there's an entry in the account            |
| 18 | history dated June 15, which states, IBR         |
| 19 | submitted, awaiting documentation review.        |
| 20 | Do you see that? It's the very top               |
| 21 | entry.   |
| 22 | A. Yes, I see that.                              |
| 23 | Q. And, Mr. Stine, I just want to                |
| 24 | clarify for the record, I skipped a bunch of     |
| 25 | documents just in the interest of time, but just |
|    |  |

| 1  | financial hardship. Borrower agreed to terms      |
|----|---|
| 2  | orally.   |
| 3  | Q. So do you know why this 60-day                 |
| 4  | administrative forbearance was removed?           |
| 5  | A. So in this case the forbearance was            |
| 6  | applied incorrectly. That was an incorrect        |
| 7  | status to use.                                    |
| 8  | Q. Okay. But we had discussed earlier             |
| 9  | that at this point she's applying to switch her   |
| 10 | repayment plan from the income-sensitive plan to  |
| 11 | the income-based repayment plan.                  |
| 12 | And it's my understanding that                    |
| 13 | whenever you're switching repayment plans, you're |
| 14 | entitled to that 60-day administrative            |
| 15 | forbearance. So I'm just wondering, why was it    |
| 16 | not appropriate here?                             |
| 17 | A. Well, what we're referring to right            |
| 18 | in this particular instance is the prior          |
| 19 | delinquency that occurred. So we don't use the    |
| 20 | 60-day administrative forbearance to resolve      |
| 21 | prior delinquencies.                              |
| 22 | Q. Okay. But so if on on June 22,                 |
| 23 | 2016, it was clear by then that she was switching |
| 24 | repayment plans, correct?                         |
| 25 | A. Yeah, the prior yeah, we had the               |

1 But if they select recertification, 2 the new payment plan would take effect once the 3 current plan ends. So it's just a different box to check 4 Ο. on the application? 5 I believe it's the first 6 Α. Correct. 7 question on the application, yep. 8 And then I'm looking at May 22, 2017. Ο. 9 It looks like there was another verbal forbearance. 10 11 Do you see that? 12 Α. Yeah. I believe they were able to 13 explain to the customer they still had these remaining payments under the current plan. 14 15 customer is not able to afford that payment 16 amount, so they went ahead and processed a verbal 17 forbearance for the remaining -- remaining terms. If she had done a recalculation at 18 Ο. 19 that point, would that have triggered an interest capitalization? 20 21 Α. No. Okay. Because it looks like this was 22 Ο. 23 kind of an expensive way to handle this. If she 24 had said I want a recalculation, they would have 25 gone to zero dollar payments effective